arXiv:1703.04151v1 [astro-ph.CO] 12 Mar 2017

Precision Cosmology from Future Time Delays of Lensed Gravitational Wave and Electromagnetic Signals

Kai Liao,[1,2] Xi-Long Fan,[3,*] Xu-Heng Ding,[4,5] Marek Biesiada,[4,6] and Zong-Hong Zhu[1,4,†]

[1]*School of Physics and Technology, Wuhan University, Wuhan 430072, China*
[2]*School of Science, Wuhan University of Technology, Wuhan 430070, China*
[3]*Department of Physics and Mechanical and Electrical Engineering, Hubei University of Education, Wuhan 430205, China*
[4]*Department of Astronomy, Beijing Normal University, Beijing 100875, China*
[5]*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of California, Los Angeles, CA, 90095-1547, USA*
[6]*Department of Astrophysics and Cosmology, Institute of Physics, University of Silesia, Uniwersytecka 4, 40-007 Katowice, Poland*

The "standard-siren" approaches of gravitational wave cosmology appeal to the luminosity distance estimation from the GW observation which relies on the fine details of the waveform. We propose a new waveform independent strategy based on the systems where strongly lensed gravitational waves (GWs) and their electromagnetic (EM) counterparts can be detected simultaneously. With the images and redshifts observed in the EM domain combined with very precise measurements of time delays from lensed GW signals, we can achieve precise cosmography in the era of third-generation gravitational-wave detectors. In particular we demonstrate that the uncertainty of the Hubble constant H_0 determination from just 10 such systems can decrease to $\sim 0.4\%$ in a flat ΛCDM universe.

PACS numbers: 98.80.Es, 95.30.Sf, 95.85.Sz

Introduction.— Cosmology entering a new era of precision tests requires more accurate but also independent cosmological probes. So far, all the information about the Universe accessible to us was carried by electromagnetic (EM) waves. In particular, cosmologically most important data like anisotropy of the cosmic microwave background (CMB), large scale structure (LSS) distribution, or high redshift type Ia supernovae are obtained from the EM observations. Very recently, advanced LIGO detector registered the gravitational wave signal generated by the merger of two massive black holes (BHs) [1, 2]. This breakthrough has opened a new window to the Universe - the gravitational wave (GW) one. Gravitational waves, first predicted from General Relativity by Albert Einstein, are another messenger of the Universe complementary to EM waves. Physically they are transverse waves of spatial strain, generated by time variations of the mass quadrupole moment of the source, traveling at the speed of light. As a brand new probe, GW would definitely strengthen our knowledge about the Universe and allow us to explore the new physics. This is especially important in cosmology, where complementarity between the probes increases their leverage on the cosmological parameters, crosschecks results due to different systematic uncertainties and breaks degeneracies.

It was first realized by Schutz [3] that the waveform signal from inspiralling double compact binaries can be used to measure the luminosity distance d_L to the source directly. Hence, GW together with EM counterpart signal providing the source redshift z, could be an excellent cosmological probe through the distance-redshift relation $d_L(z)$. Among the most promising GW sources, binary neutron stars (NS-NS) or neutron star - black hole binaries (NS-BH) are expected to be accompanied by detectable electromagnetic counterparts which could be kilonovae/mergernovae (see the review [4] and references therein). Moreover, it has also been proposed that the short gamma-ray bursts (SGRBs) and fast radio bursts (FRBs) could also be the counterparts to NS-NS or NS-BH mergers [5, 6].

In the past, many papers discussed the efficiency of this general approach for the planned gravitational detectors, quite recent ones being e.g. [7, 8]. However, the identification of an EM counterpart and its host galaxy still remains a big challenge, given the ~ 10 deg^2 accuracy of sky location from GW signal. Additional astrophysical knowledge might be helpful in this respect. Some authors, for example, have explored the approach of using galaxy catalogs to reduce the number of host galaxy candidates [9]. As demonstrated by Pozzo [10] even a three advanced interferometers network will be able to constrain H_0 using information from wide-field galaxy surveys as prior information for the location of a GW source with an accuracy comparable with results from the Hubble Key Project or from 7 yr WMAP data. It has been shown by Messenger and Read [11] that with known or a very well constrained NS equation of state, a tidal correction to the gravitational wave phase in the late-inspiral signal of NS-NS systems can be used to break the mass-redshift degeneracy. Later on, Messenger et. al. [12] discussed the possibility that spectral features of the post merger phase (from the hypermassive neutron star) allow the accurate extraction of the intrinsic rest-frame mass of the source, in turn permitting the determination of source redshift and luminosity distance directly from the GW signal. Another approach of breaking mass-redshift

degeneracy is to infer statistically the redshifts of the sources, by comparing the measured (redshifted) mass distribution of NSs with a universal (rest-frame) mass distribution for NSs at different redshifts [8, 13, 14].

In the EM window, strong lensing time delay as a cosmological tool has been proposed by [15] and further developed as reviewed e.g. in [16]. Quite recently this technique enabled the determination of the Hubble constant with a few percent precision [33–35]. New wide-area imaging surveys that repeatedly scan the sky to gather time-domain information on variable sources are coming online, while dedicated follow-up monitoring campaigns are obtaining tens of time delays (e.g., the COSMOGRAIL program [17, 18]). This pursuit will reach a new height when the Large Synoptic Survey Telescope (LSST) enables the first long baseline multi-epoch observational campaign on several thousand lensed quasars [27]. The strong lens time delay challenge (TDC) [28, 29] has proven that the LSST will output ~ 400 well-measured quasar-elliptical galaxy time-delay systems, with average precision $< 3\%$ and accuracy $< 1\%$. The precision is expected to be comparable with uncertainty from lens modeling, i.e. the Fermat potentials. The methods tested in TDC would provide the so-called time delay distances, primarily sensitive to the Hubble constant, but the other cosmological parameters like dark energy density, equation of state, cosmic curvature can also be well constrained with large samples.

Next generation of GW interferometric detectors, like the Einstein Telescope (ET) will broaden the accessible volume of the Universe by three orders of magnitude. Simple scaling arguments lead us to expect tens to hundreds thousands of detections per year [23]. With such a number of detectable events and with the detector horizon reaching $1 - 2$ *Gpc*, one may expect that non-negligible number of sources would be gravitationally lensed by galaxies lying in between. This phenomenon has been predicted by [24–26] taking into account full population of double compact objects (DCO) i.e. NS-NS, NS-BH, and BH-BH binaries, and their merger rates at different redshifts as suggested by the population synthesis code `StarTrack` [19]. The conclusion was that ET would register about $50 - 100$ strongly lensed inspiral events per year. These results suggest that ET will provide a considerable catalog of strongly lensed events during a few years of its successful operation.

Recently, Fan et. al. [20] proposed a new model-independent strategy to measure the propagation speed of GW based on strongly lensed GWs and their electromagnetic counterparts (also see [21, 22]). As they pointed out, such systems could be new astrophysical and cosmological probes involving the propagation of GW and EM radiation in cosmological background. From the observational point of view, another merit of strongly lensed GW-EM system is complementarity of measurements performed in two different windows. This joint observation could not only improve the estimation of parameters common to both EM and GW signals (e.g. the sky location and distance for GW-galaxy joint observation [9]) but also provide new information to improve estimation of parameters relevant exclusively to one of these signals (e.g. the inclination angle for compact binary and the luminosity function for SGRB [9, 20]).

In this letter we propose that lensed GW-EM events could provide stringent constraints on cosmological parameters. The idea is based on the complementarity between GW and EM signals. The time delays between lensed images (e.g. $\sim 10 - 100$ days) inferred from the GW observations would have uncertainties (e.g. $\sim 0.1s$ from the detection pipeline) totally negligible comparing to the uncertainty in lens modeling, while other relevant observables, like redshifts, images, can precisely be measured in the EM domain.

Methodology.— Time delays bear cosmological information through their dependence on the quantity called "time delay distance" ($D_{\Delta t}$) which is a combination of three angular diameter distances:

$$D_{\Delta t} = \frac{D_d(z_d) D_s(z_s)}{D_{ds}(z_d, z_s)} \tag{1}$$

where D_d, D_s and D_{ds} are diameter distances to the lens (deflector) located at redshift z_d, to the source located at redshift z_s and between them, respectively. Essentially, $D_{\Delta t}$ provides a distance-redshift relation. Time delay distance is related to observations through:

$$\Delta t_{i,j} = \frac{D_{\Delta t}(1 + z_d)}{c} \Delta\phi_{i,j}, \tag{2}$$

where $\Delta t_{i,j}$ is time delay between point images i and j and $\Delta\phi_{i,j}$ is the difference between Fermat potentials at different image positions. Then the idea of cosmological inference is to determine these two quantities (together with redshifts of course) in possibly most precise way. We argue that combined observation of strongly lensed EM and GW signals coming from the same source may greatly improve the performance of this method. While the dedicated, lasting many years, cadenced observations of lensed quasar system in the EM domain give $\sim 3\%$ uncertainty of time delay determination [28], $\Delta t_{i,j}$ measured with GW signals are supposed to be very accurate. The primary source of uncertainty here is from the lens modeling embodied by the Fermat potential difference $\Delta\phi_{i,j}$.

The current techniques concerning lensed quasar systems in the EM domain, including high resolution imaging combined with spectroscopic observations of stellar kinematics of the lens galaxy could give several percent uncertainty of the Fermat potential determination, which is comparable to the time delay accuracy in EM window. Let us note that bright PSFs of an AGN could cause severe systematic errors. One has to extract bright

AGN images during the lens modeling procedure using a nearby star's PSF or adopt an iterative modeling process which can accurately recover the PSF for real observations [30, 31]. Unfortunately, these operations cannot totally eliminate systematic errors, especially in the central part of AGN, because of the following three difficulties. First, due to huge intensity of light from the AGN, even a very small difference between the adopted PSF and the AGN images will lead to a non-negligible discrepancy at the level of brightness of the lensed images. Residuals make the pixels around the AGN images quite rough, not smooth and this could introduce a severe bias. Second, to avoid the saturation of the CCD of space telescope like HST, long+short exposure method has usually been adopted, i.e., the AGN region has short exposure time while the host arc region has long exposure time, and then they are put together. Therefore, the pixels in AGN region have large uncertainties. At last, the dithering and drizzling operations are sensitive to bright AGNs. In order to test the modeling techniques, Ding et al. [32] carried out a simulation exercise. They found that even if the PSF is known accurately, a strong residual in the center of an AGN is still inevitable (Figure 4-b, therein).

However, the combination of GW and EM signals in inferring the $D_{\Delta t}$ is also beneficial in improving the accuracy of Fermat potentials. In contrast to the above described standard techniques, we focus on the systems from which lensed GW and EM signals would be observed. In such systems, the EM counterparts of lensed GW signals are usually short events. Due to an absence of bright AGN, perfect host images can be obtained, being insensitive to fine details of the PSF. In principle, such image contains more information than the lensed AGN, leading to even higher precision and accuracy of lens modeling. To understand, quantitatively, the improved accuracy in the lens model with a pure host image (i.e. without the dazzling AGN), we did a detailed investigation based on the modern quality of the data and lensing modeling techniques in the following manner. According to the current lensing project H0LiCOW [36], we simulated two sets of realistic lensed images with and without the AGN. We refer to section 3 of Ding et al. [32] for a detailed description of such simulation approach. The corresponding exposure time and noise level were set based on deep HST observation. In order to assess the accuracy of the Fermat potential recovery, in our simulations we treated the parameters in an elliptically-symmetric power-law lens model, for example the radial slope, as free parameters to be inferred from observations. We found that the effect of bright PSFs influences the uncertainties of these parameters by at least a factor of five. Therefore, we conclude that with gravitationally lensed GW and EM signals, lens modeling will improve by a factor of five, though this number depends on the observing conditions.

Results.— To demonstrate the performance of our method, we studied cosmological parameter inference from gravitationally lensed GW and EM signals using simulation, in which we assumed the ΛCDM model with $\Omega_m = 0.3, \Omega_\Lambda = 0.7$ as our fiducial model. Firstly, we randomly generated a set of redshifts of sources and deflectors, based on the redshift probability distribution functions (PDFs) as calculated by [25, 26]. These PDFs were calculated in the following way. i) Considering the intrinsic merger rates of the whole class of DCO [19] and the expected sensitivity of the ET, the number of yearly detected GW events was predicted (Table 1 of [25]). ii) Then the probability that individual GW signal from inspiralling DCO could be lensed by early-type galaxies has been calculated. The demand was that lensed signals were magnified sufficiently to be detected in the ET. The deflectors were modeled as SIS with the velocity dispersions following Schechter distribution. iii) Adding all the DCO merging systems together, the total number of lensed events registered by the ET per year was predicted. This prediction is accompanied by the redshift PDF (see Fig. 2 in Ding et al. [26]), which enables us to randomly generate the samples of redshifts of the sources and deflectors. We used the standard scenario of NS-NS and NS-BH systems merging history with "low-end" metallicity evolution [19] to randomly generate 100 samples (datasets) of redshifts of the source and the lens. Each dataset consisted of 10 systems.

Then, we attributed lensing time delay to each system, typically several tens of days. The sampling distribution of time delays, depending on the random source position on the source plane, were based on the catalog made by Oguri and Marshall [27]. We also calculated the Fermat potential differences between two image positions through Eq.2. For each data-set, we added 0.6% uncertainties to the Fermat potential differences, i.e. 5 times smaller than in the EM domain. Then we maximized the likelihood to find the best-fit values of cosmological parameters. Note that we repeated this process 100 times for each dataset by using different noise seeds so that the final results were unbiased. Based on this, we plotted the PDFs and confidence contours of cosmological parameters recovered.

We performed cosmological parameters inference from the mock data we constructed. Firstly, as it is well known, the time delay distance is primarily sensitive to the Hubble constant H_0 since its inverse sets the time scale of time delays. This time scale is modified by the Fermat potential difference, which does not depend on cosmology. The dependence on other parameters, such as density parameters or cosmic equation of state is weaker and can show up when the samples are large. So, at first we chose and fixed the ΛCDM model with $\Omega_m = 0.3, \Omega_\Lambda = 0.7$ and we constrained on H_0 using simulated data representative of the future observations of lensed GW and EM signals. For comparison, we also



FIG. 1: PDF of the Hubble constant determined from 10 lensed GW and EM signals, as well as 10 lensed quasars.



FIG. 2: Confidence contours for Ω_M and H_0 parameters in flat ΛCDM model. Color conventions are the same as in Fig. 1.

considered the EM case, typical to the current state-of-the-art. That is, we considered the constraining power of the same technique of time delays combined with image separation, in systems where quasar is the source and elliptical galaxy the deflector. The uncertainty of lens modelling has been assumed at the level of 3% and the uncertainty of time delay measurements also at the level of 3% as suggested by the TDC program. The result is shown in Fig.1. Lensed systems seen jointly in GW and EM signals give much more stringent constraint, the uncertainty of H_0 being $\sim 0.2\%$ in contrast to the pure EM time delay systems having $\sim 1.5\%$ uncertainty. This can be understood because of the extra uncertainty from time delay measurements in EM domain as well as the large uncertainty of lens modeling brought by bright AGN images.

Besides the simplest case above, we also considered the flat ΛCDM universe with the matter or the dark energy density being free parameter. Fig.2 shows the confidence contours and marginalized PDFs of matter density Ω_M and H_0. The power of constraints is similar with uncertainties two times larger. In traditional approach using time delay systems observed in the EM domain, we need sizeable samples of systems to constrain parameters other than H_0. However, future observations of GW and EM lensed signals will enable us to get useful information from a few systems.

Summaries and Perspectives.— Traditional cosmological probes are based on EM observations alone. The "standard-sirens" approaches appeal to the luminosity distance estimation from the GW observation which is waveform dependent. For the first time, we propose that future time delay measurements of strongly lensed GW signals accompanied by EM counterparts can be used to obtain stringent constraints on cosmological model.

Our method has the following advantages. First of all, lensed GW signal detection coordinated with EM searches both in transient event mode (possibly at different wavelengths: radio, optical or gamma ray) would facilitate source identification. Even if EM transients would be missed gravitationally lensed systems could be searched through catalogs from large synoptic surveys within the broad location band provided by GW detector. The proposed method of cosmographic inference is waveform independent in its principle. That is, it is not necessary to disentangle fine details of the waveform leading to precise measurements of chirp masses or luminosity distances. It is only necessary to uncover the lensed nature of two GW signals by establishment that they differ only by amplitude. Even though we emphasize that precise waveform analysis in not crucial to our method, yet possible estimates of source luminosity distance would provide another boundary condition facilitating identification of strongly lensed system in the EM domain. Time delay determination from lensed GW signal would reach an unprecedented accuracy $\sim 0.1s$ from the detection pipeline or even by many orders of magnitude higher if the details of the waveform are analyzed, e.g. the moment of final coalescence can be determined with $\sim 10^{-4}ms$ accuracy. Such accurate measurements of lensing time delays can become a milestone in precision cosmology.

The only source of uncertainty comes from lens modeling whose current uncertainty level is several percents for lensed quasar systems. Note that, unlike the AGNs, electromagnetic counterparts like kilonovae, FRBs, SGRBs are not always so bright. Therefore, the lensed images might not be affected much by the bright PSFs which are difficult to extract, the exposure time can be longer, mak-

ing lens modeling much easier. In contrast, current constraints in EM domain have typical uncertainties $\sim 3\%$ for the same number of lensed systems. Moreover in order to achieve this accuracy long cadenced (lasting many years) observations of AGN light curves are necessary.

We demonstrated that only with 10 observed gravitationally lensed GW and EM signals, cosmological model parameters can be well constrained. In particular, the uncertainty of the Hubble constant can achieve $\sim 0.4\%$ with state-of-the-art lens modeling technique based on EM images.

For future studies, gravitationally lensed systems seen in GW and EM signals could be used to test modified theories of gravity. They can also serve as consistency tests for gravitational lensing studies in EM domain. Therefore it would be very beneficial if we discover such lensed GW and EM signals. Besides, accurate time delay measurements can be applied to studying galaxy structure, for example, the mass density slope of elliptical galaxies and its evolution with redshift. The idea may be extended to other lensed transient sources like supernovae, kilonovae, fast radio bursts, short GRB that have sufficient temporal features for accurate time delay estimation. Furthermore, the GW itself may contribute to measuring the lens potentials through waveform, phase, polarization etc. We look forward to seeing these systems detected and applied to cosmological and astrophysical studies in the near future.

Acknowledgments.— This work was supported by Natural Science Foundation of China under Grants No. 11633001, No. 11673008, No. 11603015. X. F. was also supported by Newton International Fellowship Alumni Follow on Funding. M.B. gratefully acknowledges hospitality and support of Beijing Normal University where a part of this work was performed.

* Electronic address: xilong.fan@glasgow.ac.uk
† Electronic address: zhuzh@whu.eu.cn

[1] B.P. Abbott, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 116, 061102 (2016).
[2] B.P. Abbott, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 116, 241103, (2016). [arXiv: 1606.04855]
[3] B.F. Schutz, Nature 323, 310 - 311, (1986).
[4] R. Fernandez and B. D. Metzger, Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. 66, 23 (2016).
[5] D. B. Fox et al., Nature (London) 437, 845 (2005).
[6] T. Totani, Publ. Astron. Soc. Jpn. 65, L12 (2013).
[7] W. Zhao, C. Van Den Broeck, D. Baskaran, and T. G. F. Li, Phys. Rev. D, 83, 023005, (2011).
[8] S. R. Taylor and J. R. Gair, Phys. Rev. D 86, 023502 (2012). [arXiv:1204.6739].
[9] X. Fan, C. Messenger, and I.S. Heng, Astrophys. J 795, 43 (2014).
[10] W. Del Pozzo, Phys. Rev. D 86, 043011, (2012).
[11] C. Messenger and J. Read, Phys. Rev. Lett. 108, 091101 (2012).
[12] C. Messenger, Kentaro Takami, Sarah Gossan, Luciano Rezzolla, and B. S. Sathyaprakash, Phys. Rev. X 4, 041004 (2014).
[13] M. Biesiada, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. 325, 1075 (2001). [arXiv:astro-ph/0104166].
[14] Z.-H. Zhu, M.-K. Fujimoto, D. Tatsumi, Astron. Astrophys. 372, 377 (2001). [arXiv:astro-ph/0107234].
[15] S. Resfdal, Mon. Not. Royal Astron. Soc. 128, 307 (1964).
[16] T. Treu, Annu. Rev. Astron. Astrophys. 48, 87 (2010).
[17] M. Tewes et al., The Messenger 150, 49-52 (2012).
[18] V. Bonvin, M. Tewes, F. Courbin, T. Kuntzer, D. Sluse, G. Meylan, Astron. Astrophys. 585, A88 (2016)
[19] M. Dominik, K. Belczyński, Ch. Fryer et al., Astrophys. J 779, 72 (2013). [arXiv:1308.1546v3].
[20] X. Fan, K. Liao, M. Biesiada, A. Piórkowska-Kurpas, Z.-H. Zhu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 118, 091102 (2017).
[21] T. E. Collett and D. Bacon, Phys. Rev. Lett. 118, 091101 (2017).
[22] T. Baker and M. Trodden, arXiv:1612.02004.
[23] European Gravitational Observatory, M. Abernathy et al., "Einstein gravitational wave Telescope: Conceptual Design Study", 2011 [available from European Gravitational Observatory, document number ET-0106A-10].
[24] A. Piórkowska, M. Biesiada, Z-H. Zhu, JCAP 10, 022 (2013). [arXiv:1309.5731].
[25] M. Biesiada, X. Ding, A. Piórkowska, Z-H. Zhu, JCAP 10, 080 (2014). [arXiv:1409.8360].
[26] X. Ding, M. Biesiada, Z.-H. Zhu, JCAP 12, 006 (2015). [arXiv:006 1508.05000].
[27] M. Oguri and P. J. Marshall, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. 405, 2579 (2010).
[28] K. Liao, T. Treu, P. Marshall et. al., Astrophys. J 800, 11 (2015).
[29] G. Dobler, C. Fassnacht, T. Treu et. al., Astrophys. J 799, 168 (2015).
[30] G. C. Chen, S. H. Suyu, K. C. Wong et. al. MNRAS 462, 3457 (2016).
[31] K. C. Wong, S.H. Sherry, M.W. Auger et. al., MNRAS, 465, 4895 (2017).
[32] X. Ding, K. Liao, T. Treu et. al., MNRAS, 465, 4634 (2017).
[33] S. H. Suyu, M. W. Augur, S. Hilbert et. al., Astrophys. J 766, 70 (2013).
[34] S. H. Suyu, V. Bonvin, F. Courbin et. al., arXiv:1607.00017.
[35] V. Bonvin, F. Courbin, S. H. Suyu et. al., Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. 465, 4914 (2017).
[36] `http://h0licow.org`